

## Tilburg University

### The role of participatory space in the development of citizenship

Huber, M.; Metze, R.; Veldboer, L.; Stam, M.; Van Regenmortel, T.; Abma, T.A.

*Published in:*

Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice

*DOI:*

[10.18352/jsi.583](https://doi.org/10.18352/jsi.583)

*Publication date:*

2019

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Huber, M., Metze, R., Veldboer, L., Stam, M., Van Regenmortel, T., & Abma, T. A. (2019). The role of participatory space in the development of citizenship. *Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice*, 28(1), 39-55. <https://doi.org/10.18352/jsi.583>

#### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice –  
2019 – Volume 28, Issue 1, pp. 39–55  
<http://doi.org/10.18352/jsi.583>

ISSN: 1876-8830

URL: <http://www.journalsi.org>

Publisher: Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences,  
in cooperation with Utrecht University Library  
Open Access Journals

Copyright: this work has been published under a  
Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No  
Derivative Works 3.0 Netherlands License

**Max Axel Huber, MSc** is senior-onderzoeker bij het  
lectoraat Stedelijk sociaal werken bij de Hogeschool  
van Amsterdam. Daar schrijft hij een proefschrift  
over zelfbeheer van residentiële voorzieningen in de  
maatschappelijke opvang en geestelijke gezondheidszorg.

**Dr. Rosalie Metze** is senior-onderzoeker bij het lectoraat  
Stedelijk Sociaal werken bij de Hogeschool van Amsterdam  
en projectleider in de Werkplaats sociaal domein Amsterdam.

**Dr. Lex Veldboer** is lector Stedelijk sociaal werken bij  
de Hogeschool van Amsterdam en penvoerder van de  
Werkplaats sociaal domein Amsterdam.

**Dr. Martin Stam** is emeritus lector Outreachend werken &  
innoveren aan de Hogeschool van Amsterdam.

**Prof. Dr. Tine van Regenmortel** is hoofd van de  
onderzoeksgroep Sociaal en economisch beleid &  
maatschappelijke integratie aan de KU Leuven en hoofd  
van de academische werkplaats Sociaal werk aan de  
Universiteit Tilburg.

**Prof. Dr. Tineke Abma** is hoogleraar Cliëntenparticipatie  
in de ouderenzorg bij het VUmc en verbonden aan het  
Centrum voor Cliëntervaringen.

Correspondence to: Max Axel Huber

Email: [a.huber@hva.nl](mailto:a.huber@hva.nl)

Received: 12 September 2018

Accepted: 13 December 2018

Category: Theory

MAX AXEL HUBER,  
ROSALIE METZE,  
LEX VELDBOER,  
MARTIN STAM,  
TINE VAN  
REGENMORTEL,  
TINEKE ABMA

## THE ROLE OF A PARTICIPATORY SPACE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CITIZENSHIP

### ABSTRACT

#### The role of a participatory space in the development of citizenship

Research and policymaking are paying increasing attention to the development of citizenship, stimulated by the transition towards a participatory society. In this paper we focus specifically

on citizens in mental health and homeless care, whose citizenship is often underdeveloped. Pols (2016) endorses the need for a participatory space outside home or work where people in a vulnerable position can develop relational citizenship. We reflect on the influence a participatory space can have on the development of individual and democratic citizenship besides the more commonly described relational citizenship. We specifically focus on characteristics of a participatory space that can influence the development of citizenship. To this end we use both theoretical insights and empirical data from a longitudinal participatory study into *Je Eigen Stek* (JES, Your own place), a self-managed transitional programme in homeless care.

JES as a participatory space contributes to the development of individual, relational and democratic citizenship, even though not all participants benefit equally. The different forms of citizenship both hinder and stimulate each other. Our paper brings to light aspects of a participatory space that can influence the development of individual, relational and democratic citizenship. We also found indications for the importance of looking at physical aspects of a participatory space in relation to the development of citizenship.

Citizens in homeless care are able to develop citizenship, supported by a participatory space if adequately facilitated. It is therefore important to assess the quality of the participatory space.

### **Key words**

Individual citizenship, relational citizenship, democratic citizenship, third space, self-managed programmes, community care, participatory space, third place, social space, social work with homeless

### **SAMENVATTING**

#### **De rol van een participatieve ruimte in de ontwikkeling van burgerschap**

In toenemende mate is in beleid en onderzoek aandacht voor de ontwikkeling van burgerschap, gestimuleerd door de transitie naar een participatiesamenleving. In dit artikel richten we ons specifiek op burgers in de maatschappelijke opvang en geestelijke gezondheidszorg, wiens burgerschap vaak onderontwikkeld is. Pols (2016) pleit voor het inrichten van fysieke ruimten tussen thuis en werk in waar mensen in een kwetsbare positie kunnen werken aan de ontwikkeling van burgerschap, een participatieve ruimte. In dit artikel reflecteren we op de invloed die een participatieve ruimte kan hebben op de ontwikkeling van individueel en democratisch burgerschap,

naast het vaker beschreven relationeel burgerschap. Specifiek beschrijven we karakteristieken van een participatieve ruimte die invloed hebben op ontwikkeling van burgerschap. Naast theoretische inzichten gebruiken we empirische data uit een meerjarig participatief onderzoek naar *Je Eigen Stek* (JES), een zelfbeheerde maatschappelijke opvang voorziening.

JES als participatieve ruimte draagt bij aan de ontwikkeling van individueel, relationeel en democratisch burgerschap, al is dat niet voor alle deelnemers in gelijke mate het geval. Participatieve ruimte als concept helpt dat inzichtelijk te maken. De verschillende vormen van burgerschap kunnen elkaar versterken en beperken. Onze analyse brengt een aantal elementen naar voren hoe een participatieve ruimte invloed heeft op ontwikkeling van de verschillende vormen van burgerschap. We vonden ook specifieke aanwijzingen voor het belang van fysieke aspecten van participatieve ruimte in relatie tot de ontwikkeling van burgerschap.

Burgers in de maatschappelijke opvang kunnen burgerschap ontwikkelen, mits adequaat gefaciliteerd in een participatieve ruimte. Daarvoor is het belangrijk zowel in onderzoek als praktijk te kijken naar de kwaliteit van een participatieve ruimte.

## Trefwoorden

Individueel burgerschap, relationeel burgerschap, democratisch burgerschap, third space, zelfbeheer, vermaatschappelijking, third place, social space, participatory space, sociaal werk met daklozen

## INTRODUCTION

Dutch mental health and homeless care is focused on an ideal of community care, aiming for people to live as independently as possible, as part of and with the support of a community (Kal, 2001; Kwekkeboom, 2004; Pols, 2016). In the Netherlands, community care is in line with a transition towards a 'participation society', in which the Dutch government expects all Dutch citizens to be able to take responsibility for their own life, become socially active and achieve full citizenship. This is subject to political and academic debate on desirability and feasibility (Abma, 2017; Metzke, 2015; Pols, 2016; Stam, 2013; Tonkens, 2014; Van Regenmortel, 2011; Veldboer, 2018). People using mental health and homeless care have difficulties integrating into the community, which limits their ability to become socially active and develop their citizenship (Abma, 2010; Kwekkeboom, 2004; Pols, 2016; van Regenmortel, 2011). Community integration

is hindered by a lack of social skills of the people trying to integrate and by processes of social exclusion and increasing social complexity (Kal, 2001; Meininger, 2013; Pols, 2016; Van Ewijk, 2009). In general, citizenship of people using mental health or homeless care is underdeveloped (Abma, 2017; Boumans, 2012; Pols, 2016), therefore Pols (2016) argues for the worth of 'social spaces' (p. 177) where participants can develop 'relational citizenship' (p. 178). This paper will explore the relation between space and different forms of citizenship, both theoretically and by using empirical data stemming from a longitudinal study into JES, a self-managed homeless shelter. We build on Pols' (2016) argument and the work of others on the relation between a participatory space and citizenship (Memarovic *et al.*, 2014; Oldenburg, 1996; Renedo & Marston, 2015; Soja, 1996; Wexler & Oberlander, 2017), and conclude by suggesting to study and develop participatory spaces' quality and the characteristics that stimulate or hinder development of citizenship.

## **THE ROLE OF A PARTICIPATORY SPACE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CITIZENSHIP**

According to Pols (2016), homeless and mental health care is so far primarily based on principles of classical, individually oriented citizenship. We define individual citizenship as the space to make individual choices, with as little outside interference and limitations as possible (Pols, 2016). This is also known as 'negative liberty' (Berlin, 1969). Individual citizenship is in contradiction with life in residential care, where participants are not required or allowed to make individual choices (Blok, 2004; Goffman, 1961; Pols, 2016). Individual citizenship presumes the ability to make individual choices, while it is argued that people need interaction with others to make individual choices (Abma 2010; Pols, 2016).

For Pols (2016) physically relocating to become part of the community is only the first step in developing community care. The next step is to develop 'relational citizenship', which entails 'living successfully with others' (2016, p. 178). Pols argues that 'social spaces' (2016, p. 177) are necessary to facilitate development of relational citizenship in addition to individual citizenship, where persons in a vulnerable position can develop social skills, relationships and networks and in the process become part of a caring community of people in the same position (Kal, 2001; Meininger, 2013; Pols, 2016).

Pols' plea for social spaces ties in to a broader argument for the worth of 'participatory spaces' (Renedo & Marston, 2015), 'third spaces' (Soja, 1996) or 'third places' (Oldenburg, 1996) – physical,

social, temporal and figurative areas beyond home (first space) and work (second space) where people can meet informally. Authors give different meanings to the terms space and place. Pols (2016) refers to social space as a physical building, focused on bonding contacts and individual benefits, Soja (1996) uses third space to describe any publicly accessible area. Oldenburg's third place (1996) refers mostly to semi-public locations, such as cafés. Both Soja and Oldenburg appear to be more oriented towards bridging contacts, contributing to the development and maintenance of a community. For readability's sake, in the rest of the paper we will use the term participatory space, entailing the physical, social, temporal and figurative meaning of the concept.

The concept of participatory space has been applied to settings that are communitarian (church, welfare), commercial (the coffee corner at the mall) and digital (which can be both communitarian or commercial) (Wexler & Oberlander, 2017). Others point out that any confined area, such as a group of people standing in a circle on the street, can become a participatory space (Memarovic *et al.*, 2014). Common in the description of participatory spaces, third spaces, social spaces and third places is that in them participants develop, maintain and share social relations and social norms that help strengthen the community. Furthermore, these spaces can be stepping stones towards participation in larger society and form an anchor for the community (Meesters, 2018; Oldenburg, 1996; Renedo & Marston, 2015; Soja, 1996; Wexler & Oberlander, 2017). Oldenburg (1996), in a Habermasian argument, claims that third places contribute to democratization and civil society by offering participants a place where they can discuss public affairs. Renedo and Marston similarly argue that in participatory spaces individuals can develop their citizenship by 'engaging, negotiating and reconstructing space' (Renedo & Marston, 2015, p. 491).

In the literature on the relation between space and citizenship there is little attention for the interaction between individual and relational citizenship, while it is known that tensions often occur between individual and relational or collective interests (Berlin, 1969; Kruiter, 2010; Mouffe, 1994). Weighing individual and relational interests, having a say and having to share that say with others, can contribute to the development of democratic citizenship (Kruiter, 2010, p. 137; Mouffe, 1994; Sie Dhian Ho & Hurenkamp, 2011). Through participation in democratic processes – in this case the management of a programme – people can develop their democratic skills and their knowledge about deliberation and decision-making while learning to accept outcomes (Dzur, 2004; Kruiter, 2010; Mouffe, 1994; Sie Dhian Ho & Hurenkamp, 2011). Dzur (2004) focuses specifically on the role of public professionals like social workers in democratizing the public domain and facilitating deliberation on public issues. Democratization is at the heart of social work (Spierts & Oostrik, 2014; Van Ewijk, 2009).

This paper explores how a participatory space can influence development of citizenship. While the discussed literature focusses mostly on the development of relational forms of citizenship, we will also include individual and democratic citizenship. We look specifically for characteristics that hinder or stimulate the development of citizenship, which we would like to call the quality of participatory spaces. We will use empirical data from our research into JES, a self-managed homeless shelter.

## **JES & SELF-MANAGEMENT**

*Je Eigen Stek* (Your own place, JES) is a self-managed transitional programme for people recovering from homelessness. The programme is located in Amsterdam as part of HVO-Querido, a traditional provider of homeless and mental health care. Although JES is part of HVO-Querido, it has a relatively high level of discretionary space (which will be discussed more extensively below). JES is financed by the municipality of Amsterdam. Participants are homeless persons who do not need intensive professional support and who feel that regular homeless care does not offer them enough freedom to work through their problems in their own way. Participants enter JES voluntarily and generally stay 12–18 months, although they can stay indefinitely. During their stay, participants can work on their problems with support from fellow participants and others. JES has room for 16 participants who manage the programme jointly, supported by two facilitators – one trained as peer expert and one trained as a social worker. Most Dutch self-managed programmes are supported by a social worker called a facilitator, who has no formal say in the management of the programme.

Self-management in the case of JES means that participants are responsible for both day-to-day affairs (e.g. household), flow-through (who gets to enter, who cannot stay and who gets access to independent housing) and strategic development (e.g. moving to a bigger building). Other self-managed programmes vary in purpose, target group, size and length of stay, although all are developed around values such as freedom of choice, shared responsibility, having a say, voluntariness, and focus on individual strength and responsibility (Tuytman & Huber, 2014). Mead (2014) describes self-managed programmes as micro-communities where participants prepare for participation in the larger community, in line with the description of a participatory space.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The empirical data for this paper stems from a longitudinal participatory case study into the process of self-management within JES. In the same period we also studied several other Dutch self-managed programmes to deepen and broaden our understanding through smaller case studies, focus groups

and invitational conferences. This paper focuses on the study into JES. The data was gathered between 2009 and 2016. The study was conducted as part of the 'Collaborative centre for the social domain' (*Werkplaats social domein*) at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences.

In our research we have followed the principles of *responsive evaluation* (Abma *et al.*, 2009) with a strong emphasis on participation and interaction as well as stimulation of a dialogue between participants that benefits both practice and research. The study was conducted by academically trained researchers, investigators with lived experience, co-researchers from the studied programmes (participants, peer workers, facilitators) and students. Participants and peer workers took on several roles, such as co-designing sub-studies and topic guides, engaging respondents, co-interviewing, and contributing to publications.

An important aspect of our research design was the inclusion of most of the perspectives in and around the self-managed programmes. Our formal data consist of narrative interviews, structured/semi-structured interviews, focus groups and document analysis (e.g. project plans, auto-publications by participants such as contributions to research publications). The research team interviewed participants (N=27), peer workers (N=3), facilitators (N=2) and other stakeholders (N=10). Several of these individuals were interviewed two to four times, resulting in a total of 56 interviews. The first author also gathered informal data through ethnographic and participatory approaches. By developing long-lasting relations with JES, the first author was able to observe development over time and the interaction between participants, peer workers and facilitators as well as between participants and others (including with researchers). Both the observations of the interactions and the development over time enabled us to gain a deeper understanding of the formal data.

The analysis aimed for equal representation of different perspectives and competing explanations (Abma *et al.*, 2009). Findings from our analysis and draft versions of research publications were discussed with representatives from JES as a group member check to improve the credibility of our findings. An earlier version of this paper was discussed with the current peer worker and facilitator of JES.

## INDIVIDUAL CITIZENSHIP

Individual citizenship is understood as the space for individual choice, unconstrained by external factors (Berlin, 1969; Pols, 2016). Although the literature does not discuss individual citizenship, in our research we found that having space for individual choice is an important motivation for



participants to start and join JES. Participants and peer workers missed space for individual choice in regular residential programmes.

Respondents state that the setup of JES stimulates participants to take and maintain control of their own lives. Participants join self-managed programmes voluntarily and to a large extent are free to decide for themselves how they want to spend and organize (or not) their day. The basic assumption of those involved with JES is that participants are capable of taking care of themselves. Normal life is maintained as much as possible, i.e. participants do household chores and grocery shopping, and keep up and develop social and societal activities. A participant states: 'if you don't make a sandwich, you have no food'. Participants can choose for themselves what they want to work on (or not) during their time with the programme. This is appreciated by participants: 'I felt like I'm living again'.

Participants of JES emphasize the literal and symbolic value of having their own key to the door of the programme, so they can come and go when they want. JES does not have a limit for how long participants can stay. A participant states: 'homeless people need security. They need to know, these are my keys, here I can get some food, there I can find my bed, we need that structure. Otherwise it would be like, what do I do tomorrow? How do I get food?' The physical space JES offers to participants contributes to their mental space to make individual choices. People in severe vulnerable positions (poverty, homelessness) often lack this space (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2014; Van Regenmortel *et al.*, 2006).

Not all participants benefit from the space for individual choice JES offers. Participants who do not want or are not able to take control of their life stagnate in their development or drop out. Respondents call the process of stagnating the 'fyke of self-management', because participants use the freedom of choice, including the absence of a time limitation, to do nothing. In many cases, participants caught in the fyke of self-management become active over time because they see other participants achieving progress (social comparison) or are being pushed by others (social control). The processes of social comparison and social control described by respondents support the argument of Pols (2016) and others that the development of individual citizenship is related to the social environment.

## **RELATIONAL CITIZENSHIP**

Based on the literature, we understand relational citizenship as the development of social functioning (Pols, 2016): as a participatory space JES might contribute to developing social support, social roles and social skills.

Many participants and peer workers involved with JES have experienced social exclusion and marginalization. The degree to which they describe themselves as being socially excluded varies, as does the interest in developing relational citizenship. Some participants describe themselves as springing back to life within the 'family' or 'community' that JES is to them. By participating in JES they have developed/redeveloped social roles and skills. Other participants are less interested in developing relational citizenship: according to peer workers and facilitators they can and do still benefit from JES because they develop skills and experiences by living and working together, which in turn improves their social functioning outside the programme.

Living and working together in a shared space has a two-sided influence on the development of relational citizenship. On the one hand, respondents argue that participants are reluctant to be open about themselves and show vulnerability because they have little room to avoid confrontation afterwards. 'It regularly occurs that one participant tries to reproach another participant [...] after which the reproached participant starts to act intimidatingly towards the first participant. This causes the first participant to think: never mind, I see him every day, I have to live with him every day' (facilitator). On the other hand, respondents state that living and working together forces participants to deal with each other, which contributes to their social skills. Living together in the same space also creates opportunities for informal exchanges and support. A participant states: 'If I had a bad day [...] if I didn't feel good, I came downstairs [to the living room], there was always someone who'd say, hey, cheer up, I've been there and everything will be all right, after the rain comes the sun, and that would calm me down'.

The literature on self-managed programmes and self-help argues that through a relational approach to problems, i.e. sharing and discussing, participants and peer workers give and receive social support (Brown, 2012; Steyaert, Kwekkeboom, & van Meulen, 2014). For similar reasons, some of the participants and peer workers and all of the facilitators in our study argue that a relational approach to problems is very important. Other participants and peer workers state that individual problems are private and that others should not interfere. They prefer to fix their problems themselves or ask a peer worker or facilitator to help them individually. Resistance against a relational approach is also found in other Dutch practices of informal care (Linders, 2009; Metze, 2015).

Facilitators and peer workers state that they try to elicit social support through subtle approaches, because trying to force social support does not fit with the principles of self-management. Although explicating social support is met with resistance, all kinds of informal social support

do take place, according to respondents. This is supported by interviews with participants, who told us they did not receive any social support while mentioning throughout the same interview various forms of informal social support, such as 'she gave me advice' and 'he asked me how my appointment went'.

A participatory space might also function as a source for bridging contacts. For participants and peer workers, JES can be a stepping stone towards other forms of social participation. Several former participants of JES said they reconnected with family and friends during and through their stay in JES. Some started participation in other organizations, as volunteers and employees. Nevertheless, many former JES participants stated that they dealt with feelings of loneliness after leaving JES. Very few respondents remained in contact with other former participants or with JES. Although it is argued that a participatory space might contribute to bonding and/or bridging social contacts (Oldenburg, 1996; Pols, 2016; Wexler & Oberlander, 2017), neither is convincingly achieved in JES.

In line with the arguments found in the literature, JES as a participatory space contributes to the development of relational citizenship, albeit to varying degrees. Not all participants are equally experienced or interested in developing relational citizenship, claiming a focus on their individual interests.

## **DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP**

We define democratic citizenship as participating in a deliberative process on weighing individual and collective interests (Kruiter, 2010; Mouffe, 1994). Although democratic citizenship is not included in the literature on participatory spaces, we found that in the case of JES, self-managing a participatory space can contribute to the development of democratic citizenship.

In JES, participants not only live and work together: they collectively manage their living and working space. Participants, peer workers and social workers deliberate continuously in JES on how to live and work together, how to distribute and expand the available resources (shelter, support, access to housing), and what to deliberate on. There is a weekly meeting in JES on Monday evening, the only place where formal decisions can be made. Participants come together to discuss current affairs, from the household schedule and new participants to possibly moving the programme to a larger building. The agenda for the meeting is made by the participants in interaction with other stakeholders (i.e. the facilitators, the mother organization). Neither peer

workers nor facilitators have a formal vote in decisions, although they do weigh in their opinion during the meeting. For participants who are used to life being something that happens to them, having a say on their living environment and having to share that say with other participants is a new experience. Several participants express pride on managing the programme and the space themselves: 'Because what we are doing, it is pretty unique' (peer worker).

A recurring theme in conversations between participants, peer workers and facilitators is how to deal with people who actively or passively choose to not move forward, and with those who put their individual interest before the collective interest, for example in terms of contributing to the household or management. By being jointly responsible for the space, participants have to work out a solution together, for instance by reproaching those participants who neglect their responsibilities for the collective interest. Facilitators prefer participants and peer workers to solve problems themselves, although if the process of self-management is threatened the facilitator will interfere.

Not all involved have the same vision on the development of democratic citizenship within self-managed programmes. The facilitators and some participants and peer workers subscribe to the ideal of deliberative decision-making. A peer worker states: '...every new participant, you need to involve him, so that he grows alongside the process of ensuring the continued independent existence of JES'. Together with participants and peer workers, facilitators engage in deliberative processes on alternative solutions to tensions between collective and individual interests. Other participants and peer workers emphasize the importance of having structure and order, including clear leadership. 'JES needs to move ahead. [...] That they are still talking about the cleaning is a problem, groceries are a problem [...] we have been talking about that for years [...] Rules that were made in the past are now being changed. Is that better?' (former participant). In response to an earlier version of this paper, a facilitator states that self-management demands a lot of engagement, time and social skills from peer workers and participants. Combined with the stress participants experience from their individual problems, one facilitator argues that the desire for structure and leadership is understandable. Participants who are not involved with the management of the programme can still benefit at the individual and relational level, although the development of democratic citizenship is limited, according to respondents and observations of the first author.

Through the model of self-management, participants of JES, in interaction with peer workers and facilitators, have a say about the space they live and work in that they have to share with others.

#### THE ROLE OF A PARTICIPATORY SPACE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CITIZENSHIP

Through the process of self-management, participants can develop their democratic citizenship. Participants, peer workers, facilitators and managers all stress the importance of participants being in control so as to prevent tokenistic processes – a point also emphasized in literature on citizen participation (Arnstein, 1969; Crocker, 2007).

#### **INTERACTION BETWEEN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND THE ORGANIZATIONAL AND SOCIETAL CONTEXT**

The functioning of JES as a participatory space is influenced by and influences the organizational and societal context in which it operates. The degree to which HVO-Querido has created space for collective self-management in JES does appear to be substantial compared to other self-managed programmes. This amount of discretionary space offered to JES is appreciated by participants, peer workers and facilitators and, according to the respondents and observations of the first author, allows JES as a participatory space to contribute to the development of the various types of citizenship. This is not to say there aren't tensions between self-management and organizational processes within HVO-Querido.

According to respondents, the prolonged financially and socially vulnerable position of individual participants causes stress, distrust towards other participants and institutions, and a focus on individual interest. In turn, the individual orientation, stress and distrust hinder the development of different forms of citizenship. As described, JES offers participants the space to relieve stress. Facilitators and peer workers try to counter distrust and participants' self-orientation by stimulating the development of relational and democratic citizenship, and in the process are met with the same distrust and individual orientation they are trying to counter.

Facilitators and peer workers also try to stimulate collectivizing individual problems of participants, finding shared issues, and using a collective issue as a starting point for collective action. To illustrate: JES successfully started a project to remit 'homeless fines', such as those for sleeping rough or public urination. These fines got in the way of starting debt relief. Several JES participants were involved in the project, talking to the district attorney and other stakeholders, although the facilitator played a crucial role by involving his network and coaching participants. Throughout this project, JES offered space to develop collective action.

To prevent advocating for participants but without them, facilitators try to stimulate participants and peer workers to advocate for themselves. Participants make movies about themselves and

the programmes, meet with policymakers and public officials, and participate in meetings of the local council. Results include gaining limited administrative pressure as well as access to housing. For participants it is a powerful experience to advocate for their own interests and those of the programme: 'Last year I was freezing in a boat, now I'm talking to the local council'. In this way, participants become active in the larger democratic process of society. Other participants say they are inspired by seeing their peers advocate for JES.

Although we focus on the development of citizenship within a participatory space, the organizational and societal context should be taken into account, as context can both hinder and stimulate the development of citizenship.

## DISCUSSION

This paper reflects on the influence a participatory space can have on the development of individual, relational and democratic citizenship, using a case study into JES, a self-managed programme. We build on the work of others who have explored the relation between citizenship and participatory spaces (Memarovic *et al.*, 2014; Oldenburg, 1996; Pols, 2016; Renedo & Marston, 2015; Soja, 1996; Wexler & Oberlander, 2017). While other authors focus mainly on the development of relational citizenship, we included individual and democratic citizenship and focused on characteristics of participatory spaces that stimulate or hinder development of citizenship.

Our analysis shows that JES offers a participatory space for developing individual citizenship, which is greatly appreciated by participants and peer workers, especially as an alternative to regular residential care. A number of participants develop individual citizenship in interaction with others, through social comparison and social control. Not all benefit equally from the space for individual choice. Participants desire and experience the development of relational citizenship to a lesser degree, although most participants and peer workers say they have experienced some form of social learning, support and development of relationships and participation. Living together in a participatory space forces the development of social skills, although it can also encumber the development of social relationships. Facilitators and some participants and peer workers view the development of democratic citizenship as an important part of self-managed programmes, although not all agree. Jointly managing a participatory space stimulates participants to weigh individual and collective interests, contributing to their democratic citizenship. JES also offers space for participants, peer workers and facilitators to initiate collective action, through which some

participants and peer workers gain experience in advocating for themselves and the programme. Self-managed programmes offer participants a literal and figurative space to develop various forms of citizenship, to the degree they aspire.

The argument of Pols (2016) and others that a physical space can be a facilitator for citizenship, besides a participatory space in the figurative sense, is supported by our analysis. Examples we encountered are the important role of having a key, informal meetings in the hallway resulting from living in the same space, and the significance derived from being 'part-owner' of the space where the programme is run. More attention is needed for the conditions of the physical space that facilitate or hinder the development of citizenship, for instance balancing private and public space.

Our analysis revealed several characteristics that influence development of citizenship in a participatory space. The extent to which participants and peer workers do develop the different forms of citizenship appears to depend partly on whether the setup of self-management is suited for them. According to participants, peer workers, facilitators and observations of the first author, JES as a participatory space pressures participants to develop individual, relational and democratic citizenship, because they have to make individual choices, find ways to live together, and manage the programme jointly. Different forms of citizenship both hinder and stimulate each other, for instance a participant who chooses to withdraw from the collective process or the peer supporter who encourages participants to become politically active. As Tonkens (2014) argues, the development of citizenship is not a spontaneous process. Developing citizenship requires work from participants, peer workers, facilitators and organizations.

In this paper we have reflected on the influence a participatory space can have on development of citizenship using the outcomes from our research into self-managed programmes. Future research that further conceptualizes participatory space, different forms of citizenship, and the aforementioned characteristics in the data gathering and analysis process might yield more specific outcomes. We focused mainly on the development of citizenship within a participatory space, although in the last section we briefly described the interaction with the societal and organizational context. As mentioned in the introduction of this paper, processes of social exclusion and social complexity make it harder for people in vulnerable positions to develop their citizenship (Pols, 2016; Tonkens, 2014; Van Ewijk, 2009). Through a participatory space, participants might become better equipped to develop their citizenship outside of that participatory space, although further research is needed to explore the relation between citizenship within and outside a participatory space.

Looking at the quality of participatory spaces in relation to the development of citizenship can contribute to both practice and research into the development of citizenship within participatory spaces. This paper provides a preliminary framework for further development.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The empirical data on which this paper was based is gathered and analysed as part of the 'Collaborative centre for the social domain', financed by the Dutch government. Additional funds have been provided by care organizations. The authors would like to thank participants, peer workers, facilitators and other stakeholders for their contribution to designing and conducting this study.

## REFERENCES

- Abma, T. A. (2010). *Herinneringen en dromen van zeggenschap [Memories and dreams of voice]*. Amsterdam: Boom Lemma.
- Abma, T. A. (2017). Participatie moet anders: van red jezelf naar erbij horen [Participation needs to change: from self-sufficiency to inclusion]. Retrieved January 26, 2018, from <https://www.socialevraagstukken.nl/participatie-moet-anders-van-red-jezelf-naar-erbij-horen/>.
- Abma, T. A., Nierse, C. J., & Widdershoven, G. A. M. (2009). Patients as partners in responsive research: methodological notions for collaborations in mixed research teams. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(3), 401–415. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732309331869>.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35(4), 216–224. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>.
- Berlin, I. (1969). Two concepts of liberty. In *Four essays on liberty* (pp. 15–35). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blok, G. (2004). *Baas in eigen brein [Boss in your own brain]*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Nieuwezijds.
- Boumans, J. (2012). *Naar het hart van empowerment. Een onderzoek naar de grondslagen van empowerment [Towards the heart of empowerment. A study into the foundations of empowerment]*. Utrecht: Movisie.
- Brown, L. D. (2012). *Consumer-run mental health: Framework for recovery*. New York: Springer.
- Crocker, D. A. (2007). Deliberative participation in local development. *Journal of Human Development*, 8(3), 431–455. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14649880701462379>.
- Dzur, A. W. (2004). Democratic professionalism: Sharing authority in civic life. *The Good Society*, 13(2), 6–14. <http://doi.org/10.1353/gso.2004.0026>.



- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums. Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Kal, D. (2001). *Kwartiermaken voor mensen met een psychiatrische achtergrond* [Making quarter for people with a psychiatric background]. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Boom.
- Kruiter, A. J. (2010). *Mild despotisme: de hedendaagse democratie en verzorgingsstaat door de ogen van Alexis de Tocqueville* [Mild despotism: current democracy through the eyes of Alexis de Tocqueville]. Tilburg: Tilburg University.
- Kwekkeboom, R. (2004). *De waarde van Vermaatschappelijking* [the worth of community care]. Breda: Avans university of applied sciences.
- Linders, L. (2009). Niet de sterkste schouders[not the strongest shoulders]. *Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice*, 16(2), 13–24. <http://doi.org/10.18352/jsi.101>.
- Mead, S. (2014). *Intentional peer support: An alternative approach*. Vermont: Intentional Peer Support.
- Meesters, J. (2018). *Ruimte Voor Opgroeien. Jongeren en het belang, van de informele wereld* [Space for growing up. Youth and the importance of the informal world]. Utrecht: Humanistic University.
- Meininger, H. P. (2013). Inclusion as heterotopia: Spaces of encounter between people with and without intellectual disability. *Journal of Social Inclusion*, 4(1), 24–44. Retrieved from <https://josi.journals.griffith.edu.au/index.php/inclusion/article/view/252>.
- Memarovic, N., Fels, S., Anacleto, J., Calderon, R., Gobbo, F., & Carroll, J. M. (2014). Rethinking third places: Contemporary design with technology. *The Journal of Community Informatics*, 10(3), 1–16. Retrieved from <http://ci-journal.org/index.php/ciej/article/view/1048>.
- Metze, R. (2015). Independence or interdependence. A responsive evaluation on Family Group Conferencing for older adults. European Societies. Amsterdam: Hogeschool van Amsterdam/Vrije universiteit Amsterdam.
- Mouffe, C. (1994). *The return of the political*. London-New York: Verso. <http://doi.org/10.2307/20046845>.
- Mullainathan, S., & Shafir, E. (2014). *Scarcity: The new science of having less and how it defines our lives*. New York: Picador.
- Oldenburg, R. (1996). Our vanishing "third places." *Planning Commissioners Journal*, 25, 6–10.
- Pols, J. (2016). Analyzing social spaces: Relational citizenship for patients leaving mental health care institutions. *Medical Anthropology: Cross Cultural Studies in Health and Illness*, 35(2), 177–192. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01459740.2015.1101101>.
- Renedo, A., & Marston, C. (2015). Spaces for citizen involvement in healthcare: An ethnographic study. *Sociology*, 49(3), 488–504. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0038038514544208>.

- Sie Dhian Ho, M., & Hurenkamp, M. (2011). De democratische ervaring [The democratic experience]. *S&D*, 68(11/12), 54–60. Retrieved from <https://dnpprepo.ub.rug.nl/10464/>.
- Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Spierts, M., & Oostrik, H. (2014). Democratische wortels. Over de professionele logica van het sociaal werk [Democratic roots: On the professional logic of social work]. *Maatwerk*, 15(6), 21–23.
- Stam, M. (2013). Het belang van onzeker weten. Over de revisie van de verzorgingsstaat [The importance of insecure knowing. On the revision of the welfare state]. Amsterdam: Hogeschool van amsterdam.
- Steyaert, J., Kwekkeboom, R., & van Meulen, M. (2014). *Gesteund door zelfhulp [Supported by self-help]*. Utrecht: Movisie.
- Tonkens, E. (2014). Vijf misvattingen over de participatiesamenleving [Five misunderstandings about the participatory society]. Retrieved August 28, 2018, from <https://www.socialevraagstukken.nl/misverstanden-over-de-participatiesamenleving/>.
- Tuynman, M., & Huber, M. A. (2014). Maatschappelijke opvang in zelfbeheer [Self-managed homeless care]. Utrecht/Amsterdam.
- Van Ewijk, H. (2009). Citizenship-based social work. *International Social Work*, 52(2), 158–170. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0020872808099728>.
- Van Regenmortel, T., Demeyer, B., Vandenbempt, K., & Van Damme, B. (2006). Zonder (t)huis [Without home]. Leuven: LannooCampus.
- Van Regenmortel, T. (2011). Lexicon van empowerment [Lexicon of empowerment]. Utrecht: Marie Kamphuis stichting.
- Veldboer, L. (2018). De stad als setting van sociaal werk [The city as setting for social work]. Amsterdam: Amsterdam university of applied sciences.
- Wexler, M. N., & Oberlander, J. (2017). The shifting discourse on third places: Ideological implications. *Journal of Ideology*, 38(1), 1–34. Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ji/vol38/iss1/4>.